

Multipath TCP Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Experimental  
Expires: May 7, 2020

M. Amend  
Deutsche Telekom  
J. Kang  
Huawei  
November 4, 2019

Multipath TCP Extension for Robust Session Establishment  
draft-amend-mptcp-robe-01

Abstract

Multipath TCP extends the plain, single-path limited, TCP towards the capability of multipath transmission. This greatly improves the reliability and performance of TCP communication. For backwards compatibility reasons the Multipath TCP was designed to setup successfully an initial path first, after which subsequent paths can be added for multipath transmission. For that reason the Multipath TCP has the same limitations as the plain TCP during connection setup, in case the selected path is not functional.

This document proposes a set of implementations and possible combinations thereof, that provide a more Robust Establishment (RobE) of MPTCP sessions. It includes RobE\_TIMER, RobE\_SIM, RobE\_eSIM and RobE\_IPS.

RobE\_TIMER is designed to stay close to MPTCP in that standard functionality is used wherever possible. Resiliency against network outages is achieved by modifying the SYN retransmission timer: If one path is defective, another path is used.

RobE\_SIM and RobE\_eSIM provides the ability to simultaneously use multiple paths for connection setup. They ensure connectivity if at least one functional path out of a bunch of paths is given and offers beside that the opportunity to significantly improve loading times of Internet services.

RobE\_IPS provides a heuristic to select properly an initial path for connection establishment with a remote host based on empirical data derived from previous connection information.

In practice, these independent solutions can be complementary used. This document also presents the design and protocol procedure for those combinations in addition to the respective stand-alone solutions.

Internet-Draft

MPTCP RobE

November 2019

## Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on May 7, 2020.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2019 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">1.1.</a>	Terminology . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Implementation without MPTCP protocol adaptation . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">2.1.</a>	Re-transmission Timer(RobE_TIMER) . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">2.2.</a>	Simultaneous Initial Paths Simple Version (RobE_SIM) . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">2.3.</a>	Heuristic Initial Path Selection (RobE_IPS) . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">2.3.1.</a>	Architecture . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">2.3.2.</a>	Typical Scenarios . . . . .	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">2.3.3.</a>	Path decision information . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>


2.3.4.	Initial Path Selection use local RTT information . . .	14
2.4.	Combination of RobE_SIM and RobE_IPS . . . . .	14
2.5.	Combination of RobE_TIMER and RobE_IPS . . . . .	15
3.	Implementation with Bi-directional MPTCP Support . . . . .	16
3.1.	Simultaneous Initial Paths Extended Version (RobE_eSIM) .	16

3.1.1.	RobE_eSIM implicit Negotiation and Procedure . . . . .	17
3.1.2.	RobE_eSIM explicit Negotiation and Procedure . . . . .	18
3.1.3.	Protocol Adaptation . . . . .	19
3.1.4.	Fallback Mechanisms . . . . .	20
3.1.5.	Comparison Robe_SIM and RobE_eSIM . . . . .	22
3.1.6.	Security Consideration . . . . .	23
3.2.	Heuristic Initial Path Selection with remote RTT Measurement . . . . .	23
3.2.1.	Description . . . . .	23
3.2.2.	Protocol Adaptation . . . . .	24
3.2.3.	Fallback Mechanism . . . . .	25
3.2.4.	Security Consideration . . . . .	25
4.	IANA Considerations . . . . .	25
5.	Informative References . . . . .	26
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	26

1. Introduction

Multipath TCP Robust Session Establishment (MPTCP RobE) is a set of extensions to regular MPTCP [[RFC6824](#)] and its next upcoming version [[I-D.ietf-mptcp-rfc6824bis](#)], which releases single path limitations during the initial connection setup. Several scenarios require and benefit from a reliable and in time connection setup which is not covered by [[RFC6824](#)] and [[I-D.ietf-mptcp-rfc6824bis](#)] so far. MPTCP was designed to be compliant with the TCP standard [[RFC0793](#)] and introduced therefore the concept of an initial TCP flow while adding subsequent flows after successful multipath negotiation on the initial path. While fulfilling its purpose, MPTCP is however fully dependent on the transmission characteristics of the communication link selected for initiating MPTCP.

Figure 1 shows the traditional way of MPTCP handshaking with a MP\_CAPABLE exchanged first, followed when successful negotiated by additional flows engaging MP\_JOIN. [[RFC6824](#)] and the upcoming next MPTCP [[I-D.ietf-mptcp-rfc6824bis](#)] differ in that a Key-A is sent with the first MP\_CAPABLE or not.



[\*] Key-A in the first MP-capable is related to [RFC6824](#) only and does not exist in RFC6824bis.

Figure 1: MPTCP connection setup

Multipath TCP itself enables hosts to exchange packets belonging to a

single connection over several paths. Implemented in mobile phones (UEs), these paths are usually assigned to different network interfaces within the UE and corresponds to different networks such as cellular and WiFi. The path or network interface for initiating the initial subflow setup is most often provided by the operation system of the UE. For example, if a cellular connection and WiFi are present in a mobile phone, WiFi is usually the interface offered to initiate the MPTCP session.

This design falls short in situations where the default path does not provide the best performance compared to other available paths. In a worst case the default path is not even capable of setting up the initial flow letting any other functional path unused. For example, if the WiFi signal is weak, broken or cannot forward traffic to the destination, the establishment of the subflow will be delayed or impossible. This in turn, leads to a longer startup delay or no communication at all for services using MPTCP even if other functional paths are available. Even in scenarios where all paths

are functional but services would benefit from a setup over the path with the lowest latency, MPTCP has no mean to support this demand.

It can be concluded, that sequential path establishment relying with an initial path establishment over an external given default route will result in experience reduction when using MPTCP. So this document proposes solutions to overcome the aforementioned limitations and provides a more robust connection setup compared to traditional MPTCP.

RobE\_SIM and RobE\_eSIM aims to overcome the limitations of [[RFC6824](#)] and [[I-D.ietf-mptcp-rfc6824bis](#)], using one initial flow and introduces the concept of potential initial flows triggered simultaneously. Potential initial flows gives the freedom to use more than one path to request multipath capability and select the initial flow at a later point. RobE\_SIM is a break-before-make mechanism, guaranteeing at least the robust connection establishment, however the RobE\_eSIM reuses every potential initial flow request to combine it with less overhead and accelerated multipath availability, leveraging a new MPTCP option MP\_JOIN\_CAP. From a standardization perspective, the RobE\_SIM is fully compliant with [[RFC6824](#)] and [[I-D.ietf-mptcp-rfc6824bis](#)] and is herein more of a descriptive and

procedural nature. The RobE\_eSIM requires a new MPTCP option but with the potential to significantly improve the MPTCP experience.

For the limitation of the default initial path, RobE\_IPS makes no changes to standard MPTCP procedure and improves the performance of connection establishment by introducing an initial path selection strategy and required algorithms. The input for strategy and algorithms is the transmission status information which represents the transmission performance of each available path or network interface. The transmission status information is characterized by at least one of the parameters: signal strength, throughput, round-trip time (RTT) and link success rate. In this way, a path with better transmission performance can be learned and determined and the respective network interface can be used for connection establishment.

The most simple approach for a robust MPTCP session establishment is RobE\_TIMER, iterating the process of initial path establishment over all available paths, if the previous try has failed. Triggering a new try on a next path is depending on an expiration timer, preferably re-use TCP's in-built expiration timer.

Table 1 summarizes the impact of RobE\_TIMER, RobE\_SIM, RobE\_eSIM and RobE\_IPS compared to [\[RFC6824\]](#) and [\[I-D.ietf-mptcp-rfc6824bis\]](#).

Scenario	MPTCP	RobE_TIMER	RobE_SIM	RobE_eSIM	RobE_IPS
IP packet loss	Delayed connection	In the scope of timer	No impact	No impact	Delayed connection
IP broken	No connection	In the scope of timer	No impact	No impact	No connection
IP setup duration	Default route	Default route (+ path 1..n)	Fastest path	Fastest path	Selected path

depende ncy						
MP avai labilit y durat ion	MP_CAP ABLE HS + M P_JOIN HS	sum_1..n(MP_C APABLE_n HS) + MP_JOIN HS	MP_CAP ABLE HS + M P_JOIN HS	max(MP_CAPA BLE_1 .. MP _CAPABLE_n HS)	MP_CAPA BLE HS + MP_JOIN HS	
Guarant eeing session setup	Depend s on the de fault route	Yes	Yes	Yes	Depends on sele ction	

IP: Initial Path; MP: Multi-Path; HS: Handshake

Table 1: Overview RobE features during initial connection setup

## 1.1. Terminology

This document makes use of a number of terms that are either MPTCP-specific or have defined meaning in the context of MPTCP, as follows:

**Path:** A sequence of links between a sender and a receiver, defined in this context by a 4-tuple of source and destination address/port pairs.

**Subflow:** A flow of TCP segments operating over an individual path, which forms part of a larger MPTCP connection. A subflow is started and terminated similar to a regular TCP connection.

## 2. Implementation without MPTCP protocol adaptation


RobE\_TIMER, RobE\_SIM and RobE\_IPS are compatible with the current MPTCP protocol definitions in [RFC6824] and [I-D.ietf-mptcp-rfc6824bis] but may lack of the full optimization potential which require protocol adaptation in [Section 3](#). Following sections will describe them in detail.

## [2.1.](#) Re-transmission Timer(RobE\_TIMER)

In RobE\_TIMER, a new connection is initiated by sending a SYN+MP\_CAPABLE along the initial path. If this path is functional, the solution will perform identical to classic MPTCP: the initial flow will be established, and subsequent flows can be created afterwards. If however the initial path is faulty, the retransmission will be triggered on another path. This path might circumvent the dysfunctional network, and allow the client to create an initial subflow. The first path is now seen as a subsequent path and the client sends SYN+MP\_JOIN messages to create a subsequent flow.

In high latency networks, the initial SYN+MP\_CAPABLE might be delayed until the client retries on another path. Once the second SYN arrives at the server, it will try to complete the three-way handshake. If the first SYN was delayed by more than the retransmission time plus half a Round Trip Time (RTT) of the second path, it will arrive at the server after the second SYN. The server could now treat the segment as obsolete and drop it.





[\*] Key-A in the first MP-capable is related to [RFC6824](#) only and does not exist in RFC6824bis.

Figure 2: The Robe\_TIMER Solution


Immediately after sending the final ACK of the initial handshake, subflows are established on the remaining paths as defined in [RFC6824](#) and [\[I-D.ietf-mptcp-rfc6824bis\]](#)

[Notes: How to set the Timer is TBD. If there is the case that the first SYN on default path arrives earlier than that from the second path, the MPTCP connection will be initialized on the path of the first SYN. The server could treat the second SYN as obsolete and drop it.]

## 2.2. Simultaneous Initial Paths Simple Version (RobE\_SIM)

RobE\_SIM is a sender only implementation and no negotiation is required. In RobE\_SIM, the MPTCP connection setup benefits from the fastest path. As shown in Figure 3, host A initiates the connection handshake on more than one path independently (SA1 and SA2). The paths selected for RobE\_SIM and referred to as potential initial flows, can belong to the number of interfaces on the device or a subset selected on experience. When Host A receives the first SYN/ACK back from Host B (SA3), the path carrying this message is identified as the normal initial path. Host A sends then immediately a TCP RST message (SA6.1) on any other path used for simultaneous connection setup causing an immediate termination of assigned flows (break-before-make). The terminated ones are merged as subsequent subflows following the JOIN procedure described in [RFC6824](#) and

[[I-D.ietf-mptcp-rfc6824bis](#)]. The process is equivalent to any other scenario where the SYN/ACK arrives on an other path than depicted in Figure 3.



[\*] Key-A in the first MP-capable is related to [RFC6824](#) only and does not exist in RFC6824bis.

Figure 3: MPTCP RobE\_SIM Connection Setup

### 2.3. Heuristic Initial Path Selection (RobE\_IPS)

#### 2.3.1. Architecture

Figure 4 provides the architecture for RobE\_IPS and employs an "Initial Path Selection" logic which can be integrated into the MPTCP stack or exists as an isolated module in the terminal. The IPS logic has access to a set of transmission status information for each available path or its belonging network interfaces. When an application starts a first communication, IPS selects based on the available path transmission characteristics the path with the highest probability to succeed.

Internet-Draft

MPTCP RobE

November 2019




Figure 4: Architecture for Initial-path Selection

### [2.3.2.](#) Typical Scenarios

Two typical RobE\_IPS scenarios are presented in this section. Figure 5 shows that the "Initial Path Selection" logic executed for each MPTCP connection establishment. On the other hand Figure 6 describes that "Initial Path Selection" in case no path information are available. Considering the fact that no heuristics are given before a recent MPTCP connection was established, the default initial path can be adopted. Further combinations and implementations with more or less sophisticated heuristics are possible.





Figure 5: RobE\_IPS for each connection establishment







Figure 6: RobE\_IPS using default route when no meaningful heuristic available

Figure 7 shows the process flow of "Initial Path Selection". Upon a request from an application, the IPS logic will acquire transmission status information which represents the transmission performance of each available path or network interface and evaluate it. The transmission status information is characterized by at least one of the parameters: signal strength, throughput, round-trip time (RTT) and link success rate. In this way, the path with the best transmission performance can be determined and used for connection establishment.






Figure 7: Implementation process for Initial Path Selection

### 2.3.3. Path decision information

The level of heuristic can be mainly divided into three layer: application level, transport-layer level and link-layer level based on the information acquisition method. For example, RTT can be calculated for each path within a MPTCP connection and belongs thereof to the transport-layer level. The transmission status information for each available path SHOULD be characterized by at least one of the parameters: signal strength, throughput, RTT and link success rate. Application level information are more seen for statistical purposes.

- o Application level: application name, domain name, port number and location.
- o Transport-layer level: RTT, CWND, Error rate.

### 2.3.4. Initial Path Selection use local RTT information

Figure 8 presents a "Initial Path Selection" logic based on RTT, e.g. assuming two paths over LTE and WiFi access. RTT calculation on the transport layer usually reflect the time when an information is sent and an related acknowledgment received. For an asymmetric usage

(e.g. download only) of a communication it might happen that recent RTT calculation is only available on sender side which is possibly not the side which employs the IPS logic. A solution for this can be found in [Section 3.2](#). Instead of using the most recent RTT value of a path a filtered value consisting of several measured RTTs can be used. A RTT can also be derived from link layer information but may have a limited meaning when it does not picture the end-to-end latency.




Figure 8: Initial-path Selection based on RTT

#### [2.4.](#) Combination of RobE\_SIM and RobE\_IPS

In an implementation, a single solution may not be sufficient to get an expected behavior. Combination of approaches to improve robustness is recommended therefore. Figure 9 shows the combination of RobE\_SIM and RobE\_IPS. RobE\_SIM can be used at the very beginning when the sender is absent of path information followed by RobE\_IPS for consecutive connections.








Figure 9: Combination of RobE\_SIM and RobE\_IPS

### 2.5. Combination of RobE\_TIMER and RobE\_IPS

Since RobE\_IPS solely does not guarantee that session can be set up on the selection of initial path, it can also be combined with RobE\_TIMER which generates less overhead compared to the combination with RobE\_SIM in [Section 2.4](#) and guarantee session setup. RobE\_TIMER can be introduced to optimize the control of path switching when the initial path selected by RobE\_IPS is dysfunctional. When the system enables RobE\_IPS and uses the selected initial path for session establishment, it sets the timer for path switching. When timer is expired, the system will change to another path to re-establish connection according to [Section 2.1](#).




Figure 10: Combination of RobE\_Timer and RobE\_IPS

### 3. Implementation with Bi-directional MPTCP Support

Solutions which requires bi-directional support between two MPTCP hosts promise to have better and possibly more features. However, they cannot be defined without extending current standards in [RFC6824] and [I-D.ietf-mptcp-rfc6824bis]. The RobE\_SIM and RobE\_IPS approach are both capable of profit from an explicit support of the remote end host and defined within this section.

#### 3.1. Simultaneous Initial Paths Extended Version (RobE\_eSIM)


RobE\_eSIM extends RobE\_SIM by reusing the potential initial flows. This eliminates the overhead from RobE\_SIM by introducing a new option MP\_JOIN\_CAP and accelerate the transmission speed by early availability of multiple paths. Further it relaxes the dependency on

a reliable third ACK of the 3-way handshake in

[[I-D.ietf-mptcp-rfc6824bis](#)]. Remote endpoint support can be negotiated in two ways, an implicit in [Section 3.1.1](#) or explicit in [Section 3.1.2](#)

### 3.1.1. RobE\_eSIM implicit Negotiation and Procedure

Similar to RobE\_SIM in [Section 2.2](#) the establishment process of [[RFC6824](#)] or [[I-D.ietf-mptcp-rfc6824bis](#)] is applied independently on multiple path simultaneously. In Figure 11 this is shown in SA1 and SA2. The first path which returns a SYN/ACK (e.g. SA3) is selected as the initial path and proceed with the traditional establishment process (SA5). Any other path which has to send the final ACK of the 3-way handshake includes a new option MP\_JOIN\_CAP (see definition in [Section 3.1.3.2](#)) instead of a MP\_CAPABLE (SA6.2).



[\*] Key-A in the first MP-capable is related to [RFC6824](#) only and does not exist in RFC6824bis.

## Figure 11: MPTCP RobE\_eSIM implicit Connection Setup

Following the possible process in Figure 11, two further constellations are imaginable and elaborated below.

1. In the flow diagram Figure 11, A1<->B1 is assumed to be the initial flow. A2<->B1 shall be recycled and the ACK is sent with MP\_JOIN\_CAP. Furthermore, the MP\_CAPABLE arrives first at Host B

(SB5) and the MP\_JOIN\_CAP afterwards (SB6.2). When the MP\_JOIN\_CAP is received, Host B has to iterate over the connection list once (like MP\_JOIN) and check for Key-A availability. If a Key-A connection is found, this one is validated against the HMAC value. The validation has two reasons: first, several Key-A can exist, because different hosts may choose the same Key-A by accident. Furthermore, no one can join a connection by just recording/brute-forcing Key-A and duplicating the request.

2. Like above, but MP\_JOIN\_CAP arrives before last MP\_CAPABLE at Host B


\* [\[I-D.ietf-mptcp-rfc6824bis\]](#); Based on Key-A, Host B will iterate over the connection list, but it will not find a match, because Key-A of the previous selected initial flow (SA3, SA5) has not arrived yet. So it will continue with a fast iteration only over the connections which are still in establishment phase using the 10 bit Key-B fast hash (crc16(Key-B) & 0x3FF). If it matches against a (precomputed) existing Key-B\_fast\_hash in the connection list, it will validate the request using the HMAC(Key-A+B+B') to ensure legitimation. If successful, both, the initial flow and the MP\_JOIN\_CAP flow, can be immediately established. This is true, because without the knowledge of Key-B, Host A could not calculate the HMAC. So it is clear, that Host A had received the SYN/ACK (SB3). This also mitigates the exchange of a reliable ACK during the handshake process. MPTCP sends the Key-A only with the last ACK and therefore prevents subsequent flow establishment until successful reception at Host B. Using RobE\_EXT, the reception of a MP\_JOIN\_CAP ([\[I-D.ietf-mptcp-rfc6824bis\]](#)) is sufficient to establish both, the path carrying Key-B and Key-B'.

\* [\[RFC6824\]](#); Can match based on Key-A, same effort as for a MP JOIN.

3. A2<->B1 is selected as initial flow, because the respective SYN/ACK returns earlier at Host A. It is the same as above, just the other way round.

### 3.1.2. RobE\_eSIM explicit Negotiation and Procedure

The process of an explicit negotiation of RobE\_eSIM follows Figure 11 but uses the ROBE\_eSIM\_EN option Figure 13 additionally during the handshake procedure.



[\*] Key-A in the first MP-capable is related to [RFC6824](#) only and does not exist in RFC6824bis.

Figure 12: MPTCP RobE\_eSIM explicit Connection Setup

### 3.1.3. Protocol Adaptation

[3.1.3.1.](#) ROBE\_eSIM\_EN Option





Figure 13: ROBE\_eSIM\_EN\_OPTION

[3.1.3.2.](#) MP\_JOIN\_CAP Option



Key-B\_fast\_hash = crc16(Key-B) & 0x3FF -> (10bit)  
HMAC\_keys = HMAC(Key-A+Key-B+Key-B') -> (>=96bit)  
HMAC = (HMAC\_keys & ~0x3FF) | Key-B\_fast\_hash -> (size HMAC\_keys)

Figure 14: MP\_JOIN\_CAP

Computational effort on receiver side is most often expected to be the same as with MP\_JOIN. Key-A ensures identification of related flows Key-B\_fast\_hash enables MP session even when selected initial flow is not fully established yet (slight computational overhead). HMAC authenticates relationship of initial and potential initial flows.

#### [3.1.4.](#) Fallback Mechanisms


##### [3.1.4.1.](#) Fallback mechanism for implicit RobE\_eSIM

[TBD]

##### [3.1.4.2.](#) Fallback mechanism for explicit RobE\_eSIM

This mechanism considers that both sides support MPTCP capability but the receiver does not equipped with RobE\_eSIM. MPTCP session with RobE\_eSIM negotiation will seamlessly fallback to normal MPTCP process.

[Requires further check how an unaware Host B reacts on possible ROBE\_eSIM\_EN; Ignore or RST? See also [RFC6824](#) Sec. 3.6 "Should fallback [...] the path does not support the MPTCP options"]







Figure 15: Fallback to MPTCP when missing RobE\_eSIM support

### [3.1.4.3.](#) Fallback to regular TCP when missing MPTCP support

When the receiver is not MPTCP enabled, MPTCP session with RobE\_eSIM negotiation will seamlessly fallback to regular process which is illustrated in this section.









Figure 16: Fallback to TCP without MPTCP support

### 3.1.5. Comparison Robe\_SIM and RobE\_eSIM

Potential initial flows in RobE\_SIM [Section 2.2](#) and RobE\_eSIM [Section 3.1](#) guarantee MPTCP session establishment if at least one selected path for session establishment is functional. Figure 17 makes the differences between both approaches visible and points to the latest decision possibility during session setup when RobE\_SIM or RobE\_eSIM can be selected. Until SA5 in Figure 17 traditional MPTCP connection setup is independently applied on multiple paths simultaneously and offers to select the initial flow later (potential initial flows). The final decision which path is selected as the main one and the handling of the remaining flow(s) differs in SA6.1 when RobE\_SIM is applied or instead SA6.2 RobE\_eSIM.



[\*] Key-A in the first MP-capable is related to [RFC6824](#) only and does not exist in RFC6824bis.

Figure 17: MPTCP RobE\_SIM and RobE\_eSIM connection setup

### 3.1.6. Security Consideration

[Tbd, however no differences to [RFC6824](#) and [I-D.ietf-mptcp-rfc6824bis](#) are expected]

## 3.2. Heuristic Initial Path Selection with remote RTT Measurement

### 3.2.1. Description

Usually the path RTT can be determined by a time difference between sending a package and an ACK and is integrated into the TCP protocol. For asymmetric transmission, the latest RTT for TCP flows is calculated by the side which sends data at latest and possible does not correspond to the site which employs RobE\_IPS. This problem is already elaborated in [Section 2.3.4](#) and can be solved by transmitting the RTT information per subflow. The negotiation procedure is

depicted in Figure 18 and uses the MPTCP option `L_RTT_EN` defined in [Section 3.2.2](#).




Figure 18: Negotiation procedure for RTT exchange

A successful negotiation allows the exchange of the measured RTT value from one subflow of a MPTCP host to another using the "Latest RTT" field within the `L_RTT_EN` option.

### [3.2.2](#). Protocol Adaptation

Calculating the "Latest RTT" by a remote host in an asymmetry transmission scenario should be transferred from remote host to the client running RobE\_IPS. So a new MPTCP subtype option named `L_RTT_EN` is allocated for this function. During the three-way handshake `L_RTT_EN` is used for negotiation of remote RTT measurement capability between client and server (in [Section 3.2.1](#)). When both parts support the usage of remote RTT measurement, the "Latest RTT" field in `L_RTT_EN` is applied for carrying the value of latest RTT computed by the remote host.





Figure 19: ROBE\_L\_RTT\_EN OPTION

3.2.3. Fallback Mechanism

When the receiver is not L\_RTT\_EN capable, MPTCP session with L\_RTT\_EN negotiation will seamlessly fallback to normal MPTCP process.

[TBD, Need same checks as [Section 3.1.4.2](#)]



### 3.2.4. Security Consideration

[Tbd]

## 4. IANA Considerations

This document defines three new values to MPTCP Option Subtype as following.

Value	Symbol	Name	Reference
TBD	ROBE_eSIM_EN	RobE_eSIM enabled	Section 3.1
TBD	MP_JOIN_CAP	Join connection directly in RobE_eSIM	Section 3.1
TBD	L_RTT_EN	Server RTT enabled	Section 3.2

RobE Option Subtypes

Table 2: RobE Option Subtypes

## 5. Informative References

[I-D.ietf-mptcp-rfc6824bis]

Ford, A., Raiciu, C., Handley, M., Bonaventure, O., and C. Paasch, "TCP Extensions for Multipath Operation with Multiple Addresses", [draft-ietf-mptcp-rfc6824bis-18](#) (work in progress), June 2019.

[RFC0793] Postel, J., "Transmission Control Protocol", STD 7, [RFC 793](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC0793, September 1981, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc793>>.

[RFC6824] Ford, A., Raiciu, C., Handley, M., and O. Bonaventure, "TCP Extensions for Multipath Operation with Multiple Addresses", [RFC 6824](https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6824), DOI 10.17487/RFC6824, January 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6824>>.

#### Authors' Addresses

Markus Amend  
Deutsche Telekom  
T-Online-Allee 7  
64295 Darmstadt  
Germany

Email: Markus.Amend@telekom.de

Amend & Kang

Expires May 7, 2020

[Page 26]

---

Internet-Draft

MPTCP RobE

November 2019

Jiao Kang  
Huawei  
D2-03, Huawei Industrial Base  
Longgang District  
Shenzhen  
China

Email: kangjiao@huawei.com

